FILED

1 2 3 4 5 6 7	MICHAEL L. TRACY, ESQ., SBN 2377 MTRACY@MICHAELTRACYLAW.CO MEGAN E. ROSS, ESQ., SBN 227776 MROSS@MICHAELTRACYLAW.COM LAW OFFICES OF MICHAEL TRACY 2030 Main Street, Suite 1300 Irvine, CA 92614 T: (949) 260-9171 F: (866) 365-3051	2013 SEP 10 PM 2: 11						
8	Attorney for Plaintiff JOHN MITCHELL							
9	UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT						
10	CENTRAL DISTRIC	CT OF CALIFORNIA						
11	WESTERN DIVISION							
12	IOUN MITCHELL on individual on	CV 13-06624-FM						
13	JOHN MITCHELL, an individual, on behalf of himself and all others similarly	Case No						
14	situated,	CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR						
15	Plaintiff	UNPAID OVERTIME UNDER CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE,						
16	vs.	MEAL BREAKS, OVERTIME						
17 18	MEDTRONIC, INC., A MINNESOTA CORPORATION,	UNDER THE FLSA, WAITING TIME PENALTIES AND UNFAIR BUSINESS PRACTICES						
19 20	Defendant	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL						
21	Plaintiff, JOHN MITCHELL, alleges:							
22	JURISD	DICTION						
23	1. This Court has jurisdiction over this matter because this complaint							
24	alleges a federal question in that violations of 29 U.S.C. § 201 et seq. are alleged.							
25	2. This court has supplemental jurisdiction of all the State law claims							
26	under 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a). The State law claims are all related to the same facts –							
27	namely whether Plaintiff performed work a	and was not paid overtime wages and						
28	whether that failure to pay was willful. As	such, all the claims make up the same						
		1- ABOR VIOLATIONS						

case or controversy under Article III of the United States Constitution.

3. This Court has jurisdiction over this case under the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005. As alleged below, MITCHELL is a citizen of California and Defendant is not a citizen of California. There are more than 100 class members, and the amount in controversy is in excess of \$5,000,000.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

4. This Court is the proper court and this action is properly filed in the County of Los Angeles and in this judicial district because Defendants do business in the County of Los Angeles, and because Defendants' obligations and liabilities arise therein, and because the work that was performed by Plaintiff in the County of Los Angeles is the subject of this action.

PARTIES

- 5. Plaintiff JOHN MITCHELL ("MITCHELL") was jointly employed by Defendants from November 24, 2008 through the August 31, 2011. MITCHELL is a citizen of California.
- 6. Defendant MEDTRONIC INC. ("MEDTRONIC") is a Minnesota Corporation doing business in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. MEDTRONIC is not a citizen of California.

CLASS ACTION ÁLLEGATIONS

7. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated as a Class Action pursuant to Rules 23(a), (b)(1), (b)(2) and (b)(3). Plaintiff seeks to represent a class of all Sales Associates who are currently employed or have been employed by defendants within the State of California who: (1) at any time four (4) years prior to the filing of the SULTAN LAWSUIT did not have their overtime regular rate of pay calculated to include all remuneration, and (2) at any time four (4) years prior to the filing of the SULTAN LAWSUIT were not given the premium wages mandated for missing meal breaks.

JOHN Sultan filed a class action lawsuit against MEDTRONIC on May 8. 1 13, 2011. ("SULTAN LAWSUIT") The statute of limitations on these claims was tolled as of the date of the 3 9. SULTAN LAWSUIT. Until April of 2011 MEDTRONIC maintained a company-wide policy 5 10. of not paying employees for missed breaks. 7 11. Plaintiff and class members routinely worked in excess of five hours per day and were not provided meal breaks by the company. 9 12. Plaintiff and class members desired their full thirty-minute meal breaks and were denied the ability to take them by the company. 10 11 13. Plaintiff and class members had never been paid additional wages for 12 | missed meal breaks during employment until April 2011. 13 14. Plaintiff and class members were not paid their overtime compensation 14 in accordance with their regular rate of pay. 15 15. Plaintiff and class members earned commissions based on sales of various medical devices. 16 Sometime in 2010, MEDTRONIC started computing the commissions 17 16. in the calculation of the regular rate of pay on which overtime is based. 18 Prior to 2010, MEDTRONIC did not include the commission payments 19 17. 20 in computation of the regular rate of pay. MEDTRONIC became aware that their policy was illegal and changed it 21 18. to compute the commissions in the regular rate of pay but never paid the employees 23 the previously unpaid amounts. 24 19. MEDTRONIC knew it had unpaid wages due to the employees who earned commission wages but refused to pay these wages to the employees. 26 20. Instead, MEDTRONIC attempted to have the employees sign releases of wages owed even though MEDTRONIC fully knew that there were undisputed 27 28 wages that were due to the employees.

April 2011. Prior to this date they did not pay any additional wages for missed meal breaks, and after this date the company automatically pays an additional hour of pay when an employee misses a meal break.

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

19

20

21

22

24

26

27

- 23. Beginning in April 2011, the company does not inquire as to whether an employee was "provided" a meal break but simply pays the additional hour of pay when a Sales Associate did not take a meal break.
- 24. MEDTRONIC contends that its current policy of automatically paying the additional hour of pay was not required by statute but was simply a feature put into the new payroll system to pay the employees additional wages to which they would not otherwise be entitled to.
- 25. In particular, MEDTRONIC contends that "For a brief period beginning in April 2011, in connection with a changeover to a new electronic timekeeping system called Kronos, the Kronos system was initially calibrated to make payments to employees who did not clock out for a 30 minute meal period. Medtronic discovered this mis-calibration, it promptly corrected it, and those payments ceased."
- 26. The Sales Associates' normal work day consisted of 8 hours of work with overtime being paid for work beyond this period.
- 27. The Sales Associates' normal work week consisted of 40 hours of work with overtime being paid for work beyond this period.
- 28. The extra hour of pay for the missed meal was paid for work within the Sales Associate's normal work hours and/or regular working hours. That is, if an employee did not take a break on a given day after 5 hours of work, the employee would receive one additional hour of pay. This would occur even if the employee only worked 7 hours that day and did not receive any overtime pay for that day.

All Sales Associates employed by MEDTRONICS within

1	California at any time between May 11, 2007 and April 1, 2011.									
2	38. Plaintiff proposes the following Class which will be referred to as the									
3	"Regular Rate of Pay Class:"									
4	All Sales Associates employed by MEDTRONICS within									
5	California at any time between May 11, 2007 and August 31,									
6	2011who received premium payments for missed meals,									
7	commissions, or bonuses, and who worked some overtime during									
- 8	the same week for which the premium payment was received.									
9	39. Plaintiff proposes the following-Class which will be referred to as the									
10	"Waiting Time Penalty Class:"									
11	All members of either the Missed Break Class or Regular Rate of									
12	Pay class whose employment with MEDTRONIC ended within									
13	three (3) years of the filing of this lawsuit.									
. 14	40. This action has been brought and may properly be maintained as a class									
15	action under Rule 23 because there is a well-defined community of interest in the									
16	litigation and the proposed class is easily ascertainable.									
17	41. A Class Action is a superior method for bringing this action in that there									
18	is a well defined community of interest in the questions of law and fact. Questions of									
19	law and fact common to the class action include, but are not limited to:									
20	a. Whether EMPLOYER failed to pay proper premium wages for									
21	EMPLOYEES missed meal breaks.									
22	b. Whether the premium payment for missed breaks, commission									
23	payments, and certain bonuses need to be included in the regular rate									
24	of pay under California law.									
25	c. Whether the premium payment for missed breaks needs to be									
26	included in the regular rate of pay under the FLSA.									
27	42. Plaintiff and the Class Action Plaintiffs are similarly situated, have									
28	substantially similar job duties, have substantially similar pay provisions, and are all									
	COMPLAINT FOR LABOR VIOLATIONS									

subject to Defendants' illegal labor violations.

2

10

11

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

26

27

- 43. The claims of the Plaintiff are typical of those of the class, and Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent the interests of the class. Plaintiff has missed meal breaks and not been paid for them during the pre-April 2011 timeframe and has been paid for missed breaks post-April 2011 but not had the value included in his 6 regular rate of pay. In addition, Plaintiff received commission payments that were 7 | not calculated in computing his regular rate of pay. Plaintiff will represent the 8 interests of the class to maximize the payments that class members are entitled to under the law and ensure that all proper wages and penalties are paid to class members.
- 44. The persons of this class are so numerous that the joinder of all such persons is impracticable and that disposition of their claims in a class action rather 13 than in individual actions will benefit the parties and the Court. While the precise 14 number of proposed class members has not yet been determined, Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendants currently employ, and during the relevant time periods employed, over 300 putative class members.
- 45. The prosecution of separate actions by individual members of the Class 18 would create the risk of inconsistent and varying adjudications, establishing incompatible standards of conduct for Defendants.
 - 46. The questions of law and fact common to the members of the Class predominate over any questions affecting only individual member, including legal and factual issues relating to liability and damages.
 - 47. Class action treatment will allow those similarly situated person to litigate their claims in the manner that is most efficient and economical for the parties and the judicial system. Plaintiff is unaware of any difficulties that are likely to be encountered in the management of this action that would preclude its maintenance as a class action.
 - In the event that the Court determines at the notice stage or anytime 48.

thereafter that all plaintiffs and members of the class action, are not "similarly situated," the definition may be modified or narrowed, and/or appropriate subclasses may be established based on business unit or otherwise.

COLLECTIVE ACTION ALLEGATIONS

- 49. Plaintiffs bring the Third Cause of Action for violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act (hereinafter "FLSA") as a collective action pursuant to Section 16(b) of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), on behalf of all persons who are potential members of the Regular Rate of Pay Class ("Collective Action Plaintiffs").
- 50. The Third Cause of Action for violations of the FLSA is being brought and maintained as an "opt-in" collective action pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b) for all violations of the FLSA.
- 51. A Collective Action is a superior method for bringing this action in that there is a well defined community of interest in the questions of law and fact.

 Questions of law and fact common to the collective action include, but are not limited to:
 - a. Whether MEDTRONIC failed and continues to fail to pay overtime compensation at EMPLOYEES proper regular rate of pay in violation of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 201, et seq.
- 52. Plaintiff and the Collective Action Plaintiffs are similarly situated, have substantially similar job duties, have substantially similar pay provisions, and are all subject to Defendants' refusal to pay proper overtime in violation of the FLSA. The claims of the Plaintiff are typical of those of the class and plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent the interests of the class.
- 53. The persons of this class are so numerous that the joinder of all such persons is impracticable and that disposition of their claims in a class action rather than in individual actions will benefit the parties and the court. In addition, each class member must give his or her permission to be represented in this action under the "opt-in" provisions of 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

26

27

28

54. In the event that the Court determines at the notice stage or anytime thereafter that all Plaintiffs and members of the collective action, as defined above, are not "similarly situated," the definition may be modified or narrowed, and/or appropriate subclasses may be established based on business unit or otherwise. **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION** FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME COMPENSATION UNDER CALIFORNIA INDUSTRIAL WELFARE COMMISSION ORDERS AND CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE (AGAINST MEDTRONIC) 55. Plaintiff refers to and incorporates by reference Paragraphs 1 through 54. This cause of action is brought against MEDTRONIC. 56. 57. This cause is brought on behalf of the Regular Rate of Pay Class. 58. Pursuant to Industrial Welfare Commission Order No. 4-2001, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, § 11040, for the period of Plaintiff's employment, Defendants were required to compensate Plaintiff for all overtime, which is calculated at one and one-half (1 ½) times the regular rate of pay for hours worked in excess of eight (8) in a day or forty (40) hours in a week, and two (2) times the regular rate of pay for hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in a day of hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours on the seventh consecutive work day in a week. 59. Plaintiff MITCHELL worked more than eight (8) hours in a single workday or forty (40) hours in a single workweek on numerous occasions. 60. Plaintiff MITCHELL was entitled to the above overtime premiums. Defendants did not pay Plaintiff premium wages of at least one and one-61. half times Plaintiff's regular rate of pay for hours worked past eight (8) in a day. 62. Defendants did not pay Plaintiff premium wages of at least one and one

- 63. Defendants did not pay Plaintiff premium wages of at least two times Plaintiff's regular rate of pay for hours worked past twelve (12) in a day.
- 64. Plaintiff MITCHELL worked at least one pay period in which he was not properly paid overtime within the three (3) years prior to the initiation of this lawsuit.
- 65. Defendants know or should know the actual dates of overtime worked, the amount of overtime worked, and the amount of unpaid overtime due.
- 66. As a proximate result of Defendants' violations, Plaintiff MITCHELL has been damaged in an amount in excess of \$1,000 and subject to proof at time of trial.
- 67. A typical employee might work 60 hours a week and miss breaks on five different days. MEDTRONICS would pay this employee (assuming \$17/hr) \$680 in regular time wages (\$17/hr x 40 hours), \$510 in overtime wages (\$17/hr x 1.5 x 20 hours) and \$85 in meal break premiums (5 x \$17). However, the proper regular rate of pay would be \$18.42/hr. This requires that overtime be paid at \$27.63 per hour rather than \$25.50. As such, this hypothetical employee would be due an additional \$42.50 for this hypothetical week.
- 68. In addition, for work done in 2010 and prior, the commission payments made to the Sales Associates was not used to compute the regular rate of pay on which overtime was computed. That is, Sales Associates would earn commissions but that amounts earned were not used to compute the regular rate of pay on which overtime was paid. Instead, MEDTRONIC paid overtime only on the straight time hourly wage earned by the employee and did not include the commission in the calculation.
- 69. Pursuant to Labor Code §§ 218.6, 510, 1194 and California Code of Regulations, Title 8, § 11040, Plaintiff MITCHELL is entitled to recover damages for the nonpayment of overtime premiums for all overtime hours worked, penalties,

interest, plus reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit. 2 SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION FAILURE TO PROVIDE ADEQUATE MEAL PERIODS UNDER 3 4 CALIFORNIA INDUSTRIAL WELFARE COMMISSION ORDERS 5 AND CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE SECTION 512 6 (AGAINST MEDTRONIC) 7 70. Plaintiff refers to and incorporates by reference Paragraphs 1 through 69. 8 9 71. This cause of action is brought against MEDTRONIC. 10 72. This cause of action is brought on behalf of the Missed Breaks Class. 11 73. Pursuant to Industrial Welfare Commission Order No. 4-2001, 12 California Code of Regulations, Title 8, § 11040, for the period of Plaintiff's 13 employment, Defendants were required to provide a thirty (30) minute meal period 14 for any person working more than five (5) hours in a day. 15 74. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff a meal period for numerous days worked. 16 17 75. Defendants know or should know the dates for each missed meal period 18 as well as the damages due. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff at least one meal period within the 19 76. three (3) years prior to filing this lawsuit. 20 21 77. There are at least 300 employees working at any one time that did not receive their proper premium pay. A typical employee makes \$17/hr. Missing five 23 (5) meal breaks a week would amount to \$5,508,000 in total damages. Pursuant to Labor Code § 512 and California Code of Regulations, Title 24 78. 8, § 11040, Plaintiff MITCHELL is entitled to recover one (1) hour of pay at the regular rate of compensation for each workday that the meal period was not 26 27 provided. 28 79. Plaintiff MITCHELL prays for damages for missed meals in excess of

COMPLAINT FOR LABOR VIOLATIONS

\$17,680, and subject to proof at time of trial. 2 THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION 3 OVERTIME PAY AND LIQUIDATED DAMAGES UNDER 29 U.S.C. § 207 and § 216 (AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS) 4 80. 5 Plaintiff refers to and incorporates by reference Paragraphs 1 through 79. 6 7 81. This cause of action is brought on behalf of the Collective Action Plaintiffs. 8 9 82. This cause of action is brought against MEDTRONIC. 83. 10 Plaintiff is informed and believes and hereon alleges that Defendants are 11 subject to the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act. Under 29 U.S.C. § 207(a) 12 and § 216(b), Plaintiff is entitled to overtime pay at a rate of one and one-half (1 ½) times the regular rate of pay for hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours in a 13 l 14 week and an equal additional amount as liquidated damages, as well as costs and 15 attorney's fees. 16 84. Plaintiff worked numerous weeks in excess of forty (40) hours. 85. 17 Plaintiff was entitled to the above overtime premiums. 18 86. Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff for any overtime premiums. 19 87. This court has jurisdiction over this cause of action because the federal 20 statute specifically grants the employee the right to bring the action in "any Federal 21 or State court of competent jurisdiction." 29 U.S.C. § 216(b). 22 88. Plaintiff worked at least one week in which overtime premiums were not paid by Defendants under the Fair Labor Standards Act within the two (2) years prior to initiating this lawsuit. 24 25 89. Plaintiff's individual employment is covered by the terms of the Fair Labor Standards Act. 26 27 90. Plaintiff used equipment on the job that had previously been transported 28 in interstate commerce.

I	91.	Defendant MED I RONIC was the employer of Plaintiff, as the term				
2	"employer'	is defined in the Fair Labor Standards Act.				
3	92.	Defendant MEDTRONIC was an enterprise covered by the provisions				
4	of the Fair	Labor Standards Act for the entire time of Plaintiff's employment.				
5	93.	Defendant MEDTRONIC conducted business with a total gross sales				
6	volume in e	excess of \$500,000 for each and every twelve (12) month period in which				
7	Plaintiff wa	as employed.				
8	94.	Defendant MEDTRONIC employed at least two (2) employees during				
9	each and ev	very 12 month period in which Plaintiff was employed. These employees				
10	were engag	ed in commerce and regularly used equipment that had been transported				
11	in interstate	commerce.				
12	95.	Defendant MEDTRONIC was the employer of Plaintiff, as the term				
13	"employer"	is defined in the Fair Labor Standards Act.				
14	96.	Defendants' violations of 29 U.S.C. § 207 were willful and intentional.				
15	MEDTRON	NIC knew that the law required the additional wages be included in the				
16	regular rate of pay because it was specifically told so by Plaintiff's counsel.					
17	MEDTRONIC instead chooses to ignore the clear statutory requirements to pay					
18	proper over	time using the additional pay in the regular rate of pay calculation.				
19	97.	Plaintiff prays for judgment for overtime pay of \$1,000.				
20	98.	Plaintiff prays for judgment for liquidated damages in the amount of				
21	\$1,000. Th	is amount is supplemental to the relief requested in all other causes of				
22	action.					
23	99.	Plaintiff prays for costs and attorney's fees.				
24		FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION				
25	VIOI	ATIONS OF CALIFORNIA BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS				
26		CODE SECTION 17200				
27		(AGAINST MEDTRONIC)				
28	100.	Plaintiff refers to and incorporates by reference Paragraphs 1 through				
!		COMPLAINT FOR LABOR VIOLATIONS				

99. 2 101. This cause of action is brought against MEDTRONIC. 3 102. This cause if brought on behalf of the Missed Break Class and the Regular Rate of Pay Class. 5 103. By failing to pay overtime premiums under California and/or the FLSA. Defendants' acts constitute unfair and unlawful business practices under Business and Professions Code § 17200, et seq. 8 104. By failing to provide adequate meal and rest breaks, Defendants' acts constitute unfair and unlawful business practices under Business and Professions Code § 17200, et seq. 10 11 105. Plaintiff MITCHELL prays for restitution under this Cause of Action in 12 an amount subject to proof at time of trial. 13 FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION 14 PENALTIES FOR FAILING TO PAY WAGES UPON TERMINATION 15 (AGAINST MEDTRONIC) Plaintiff refers to and incorporates by reference Paragraphs 1 through 16 106. 17 105. 18 107. This cause of action is brought against MEDTRONIC. 19 108. This cause of action is brought on behalf of the members of any class 20 whose employment ended within the 3 years prior to the initiation of this lawsuit. 21 109. MEDTRONIC knew that unpaid regular rate of pay and meal payments were due to employees but refused to pay these wages when it terminated the 22 employees. 23 110. In particular, MEDTRONIC changed its policy of computing overtime 24 to include commission payments because it knew the policy was illegal. However, while MEDTRONIC fixed the problem going forward, it never retroactively paid the 26 27 employees overtime for commissions earned in the past. 111. MEDTRONIC has payroll records that show how much overtime was 28

COMPLAINT FOR LABOR VIOLATIONS

worked and how much commission was earned. Despite easily being able to compute the additional amounts owed to the employees, MEDTRONIC willfully 3 refused to do so. 4 112. Plaintiff MITCHELL prays for penalties in the amount 30 days wages for each of the class members. 6 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for the following relief: 7 8 1. That this case be certified as a class action. 9 2. That this case be certified as a collective action. 10 3. Damages for overtime not paid to Plaintiff MITCHELL in an amount in 11 excess of \$1,000 and subject to proof at trial. 12 4. For liquidated damages in the amount in excess of \$1,000 and subject to proof at trial. 13 5. For restitution to Class Members in an amount in excess of \$5,508,000. 14 15 6. Damages for meal premiums not paid to Plaintiff MITCHELL in excess of 16 \$17,680, and subject to proof at trial. 7. For restitution and disgorgement for all unfair business practices against 17 18 Plaintiff MITCHELL in an amount subject to proof at trial. 19 8. For prejudgment and post judgment interest. 9. Cost of suit. 20 21 10. Attorneys' fees. 22 11. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper. DATED: September 5, 2013 LAW OFFICES OF MICHAEL TRACY By: MICHAEL TRACY, Attorney for Plaintiff JOHN MITCHELL

23

24

25

26

27

1	<u>DEMAN</u>	ND FOR JURY TRIAL
2	Plaintiff demands a jury trial.	
3	DATED: September 5, 2013	LAW OFFICES OF MICHAEL TRACY
4		
5 6	Ву:	
7	Dy.	MICHAEL TRACY, Attorney for Plaintiff
8		JOHN MITCHELL
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16 17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		-
25		
26		
27 28		
	COMPLAINT	-16- FOR LABOR VIOLATIONS

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NOTICE OF ASSIGNMENT TO UNITED STATES JUDGES

This case has been assig	ned to District Judge	Fernando M	Fernando M Olguin		
Magistrate Judge is	Patrıck J. Walsh	_•			
The case num	ber on all documents filed v	vith the Court shou	ıld read as follo	ows:	
-	2:13-CV-6624-F	MO (PJWx)			
Pursuant to General Or California, the Magistrate Judg	der 05-07 of the United Sta e has been designated to he			District of	
All discovery related m	otions should be noticed on	the calendar of the	e Magistrate Ju	dge.	
September 10, 2013 Date		Clerk, U. S. District Court By MDAVIS Deputy Clerk			
	NOTICE TO C	COUNSEL			
A copy of this notice must be set filed, a copy of this notice must	ved with the summons and		fendants (ıf a r	removal action is	
Subsequent documents must l	oe filed at the following loc	cation:			
Western Division 312 N Spring Street, G-8 Los Angeles, CA 90012	Southern Division 411 West Fourth S Santa Ana, CA 927		Eastern Division 3470 Twelfth S Riverside, CA	Street, Room 134	
Failure to file at the proper lo	cation will result in your d	ocuments being re	turned to you	•	

Case 2:13-cv-06624-MWF-PLA Document 1 Filed 09/10/13 Page 18 of 20 Page ID #:22 Michael L. Tracy, Esq. SBN237779 LAW OFFICES OF MICHAEL TRACY 2030 Main Street, Suite 1300 Irvine, CA 92614 949-260-9171 mtracy@michaeltracylaw.com UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA JOHN MITCHELL, an individual, on behalf of CASE NUMBER himself and all others similarly situated. CV13-06624 Fmd/Psay PLAINTIFF(S) v. MEDTRONIC, INC., A MINNESOTA CORPORATION, **SUMMONS** DEFENDANT(S). DEFENDANT(S). TO. A lawsuit has been filed against you. Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received 1t), you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached of complaint amended complaint □ counterclaim □ cross-claim or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff's attorney, Michael Tracy, whose address is 2030 Main Street, Suite 1300, Irvine, CA 92614 . If you fail to do so. judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint You also must file your answer or motion with the court. Clerk, U.S. District Court SEP 1 0 2013 Deputy Cle (Seal of the Co. [Use 60 days if the defendant is the United States or a United States agency, or is an officer or employee of the United States Allowed 60 days by Rule 12(a)(3)]

SUMMONS

CV-01A (12/07)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

I (a) PLAINTIFFS (Check box if you are representing yourself □)						DEFEND	DANTS					
JOHN MITCHELL, an individual, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated					hers similarly	MEDTRONIC, INC , A MINNESOTA CORPORATION						
(b) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address and Telephone Number If you are representing yourself, provide same)						Attorneys	(If Known)					
	Michael Tracy SBN 237 Law Office of Michael T 2030 Main Street, Ste 13	гасу	Медап Е Ross SBN 2277 ne, CA 92614		9)260-9171							
II. B	ASIS OF JURISDICTIO	ON (Plac	e an X in one box only)				PRINCIPAL PA		For Diversity Case defendant)	s Only		
☐ I U S Government Plaintiff			Citizen of This S	PTF DEF Citizen of This State				PTF □ 4	DEF			
□ 2 t	S Government Defendar	nt 🗆 🗸	4 Diversity (Indicate Citis of Parties in Item III)	zenship	Citizen of Anoth	Citizen of Another State 2 2 Incorporated and Principal Place 5 of Business in Another State			e □ 5	□5		
					Citizen or Subject	t of a For	eign Country	3 □3	Foreign Nation		□6	□6
	ORIGIN (Place an X in o	ne box o	nly)									
	Original 2 Remove State Conceeding		☐ 3 Remanded from Appellate Court		einstated or	Transfer	red from another	district (s	Dist	trict Ju	opeal to dge fron agistrate	n
V. R	EQUESTED IN COMPI	AINT	JURY DEMAND: 1	Yes □	No (Check 'Yes'	only if de	manded in comp	laınt)				
CLAS	S ACTION under F.R.O	C.P. 23.	Yes □ No		s	ONEY E	DEMANDED IN	COMPL	AINT: \$ 5,527,68	30		
	AUSE OF ACTION (Cr 29 U S C Section 201 et s		S Civil Statute under wh ure to Pay Overtime	ich you	are filing and write	a brief s	tatement of cause	Do not	cite jurisdictional s	tatutes unless d	iversity)
VII.	NATURE OF SUIT (Pla	ce an X	in one box only)									
	OTHER STATUTES State Reapportionment		CONTRACT Insurance	,	TORTS	1 .	TORTS] - ` `	PRISONER		BOR	
	Antitrust		Marine		Airplane		PERSONAL PROPERTY	J	PETITIONS Motions to	710 Fair L	abor Sta	indards
	Banks and Banking		Miller Act	□ 315	Airplane Product	370	Other Fraud		Vacate Sentence	□ 720 Labor	/Mgmt	
□ 450	Commerce/ICC Rates/etc		Negotiable Instrument	□ 320	Liability Assault, Libel &		Truth in Lendii	~	Habeas Corpus	Relati		
□ 460	Deportation	- 130	Recovery of Overpayment &	320	Slander	□ 380	Other Personal		General Death Penalty	□ 730 Labor		
	Racketeer Influenced	1	Enforcement of	□ 330	Fed Employers'	□ 385	Property Dama				ting & Sure Ac	+
	and Corrupt	1	Judgment		Liability		Product Liabili		Other	□ 740 Railw		
	Organizations		Medicare Act		Marine Marine Product	B.	ANKRUPTCY		Civil Rights	☐ 790 Other		
	Consumer Credit Cable/Sat TV	152	Recovery of Defaulted	1	Liability	□ 422	Appeal 28 USC	~ ~~~	Prison Condition			
□ 810	Selective Service		Student Loan (Excl Veterans)	□ 350		□ 422	158 Withdrawal 28	F	ORFEITURE/	□ 791 Empl		;
	Securities/Commodities/	D 153		355	Motor Vehicle	J- 423	USC 157	T 610	PENALTY Agriculture	PROPERT	ty Act	ıře i
	Exchange		Overpayment of	LD 360	Product Liability Other Personal	C	IVIL RIGHTS	620	Other Food &	□ 820 Copyr		115
□ 875	Customer Challenge 12]	Veteran's Benefits	300	Injury		Voting	٦	Drug	□ 830 Patent		
-	USC 3410		Stockholders' Suits	□ 362	Personal Injury-		Employment	□ 625	Drug Related	□ 840 Trade		
	Other Statutory Actions		Other Contract	1_	Med Malpractice	□ 443	Housing/Acco-		Seizure of	SOCIALS		TY
	Agricultural Act Economic Stabilization	17 193	Contract Product	□ 365	Personal Injury-	ا	mmodations		Property 21 USC	□ 861 HIA (
- 072	Act	□ 196	Liability Franchise	D 260	Product Liability Asbestos Persona		Welfare	I 630	188	□ 862 Black		
□ 893	Environmental Matters		REAL PROPERTY	٥٥٠ تــا	Injury Product	\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	American with Disabilities -		Liquor Laws R R & Truck	□ 863 DIWC		
	Energy Allocation Act		Land Condemnation	1	Liability		Employment		Airline Regs	(405(g □ 864 SSID		71
□ 895	Freedom of Info Act	□ 220	Foreclosure		MIGRATION]□ 446	American with	1	Occupational	□ 865 RSI (4		•
□ 900			Rent Lease & Ejectment	□ 462			Disabilities -		Safety /Health	FEDERAL		JITS :
	nation Under Equal	1	Torts to Land	D 463	Application	L	Other	□ 690	Other	□ 870 Taxes		
T 050	Access to Justice Constitutionality of		Tort Product Liability	403	Habeas Corpus- Alien Detainee	□ 440	Other Civil	1		or Def	endant)	
L 730	State Statutes	L 290	All Other Real Property	□ 465	Other Immigration	, [Rights	1		□ 871 IRS-TI		y 26
	Jane Canada			[Actions			1		USC 7	609	
		L				1		1				
				-								

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Case Number

Number S L

LV13-U0624

AFTER COMPLETING THE FRONT SIDE OF FORM CV-71, COMPLETE THE INFORMATION REQUESTED BELOW

CV-71 (05/08)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

VIII(a). IDENTICAL CASES: Has this action been previously filed in this court and dismissed, remanded or closed? If No Yes If yes, list case number(s)							
VIII(b). RELATED CASES: Have any cases been previously filed in this court that are related to the present case? ☐ No ☐ Yes If yes, list case number(s) CV11-04132-MWF-PLA							
ங∕ в □ с	Arise from the sam Call for determinal For other reasons v Involve the same p	ne or closely related transaction tion of the same or substantial would entail substantial duplic natent, trademark or copyright	lly related or similar questions of law and fact, or cation of labor if heard by different judges, or calso is present and one of the factors identified above in a, b or c also is present				
(a) List the County in this District,	California County	outside of this District, State i	of other than California, or Foreign Country, in which EACH named plaintiff resides this box is checked, go to item (b)				
County in this District *		oyoto to a manioa plantett. It	California County outside of this District, State, if other than California, or Foreign Country				
Los Angeles	,		Cantonia County County of the State of the S				
			if other than California, or Foreign Country, in which EACH named defendant resides If this box is checked, go to item (c)				
County in this District *			California County outside of this District, State, if other than California, or Foreign Country				
Los Angeles							
(c) List the County in this District, Note: In land condemnation co			f other than California, or Foreign Country, in which EACH claim arose.				
County in this District *			California County outside of this District, State, if other than California, or Foreign Country				
Los Angeles							
* Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernar Note In land condemnation cases, us			San Luis <u>Obi</u> spo Counties				
X SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY (OR PRO PER)		Date 9/9/2013				
or other papers as required by law but is used by the Clerk of the Co	This form, appropurt for the purpose	ved by the Judicial Conference of statistics, venue and initiat	mation contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings e of the United States in September 1974, is required pursuant to Local Rule 3-1 is not filed ing the civil docket sheet (For more detailed instructions, see separate instructions sheet)				
Key to Statistical codes relating to So	•						
Nature of Suit Code	Abbreviation	Substantive Statement of	Cause of Action				
861	HIA	All claims for health insurance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social Security Act, as amended Also, include claims by hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of services under the program (42 U S C 1935FF(b))					
862	BL	All claims for "Black Lung" benefits under Title 4, Part B, of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969 (30 U S C 923)					
863	DIWC	All claims filed by insured workers for disability insurance benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended, plus all claims filed for child's insurance benefits based on disability (42 U S C 405(g))					
863	DIWW	All claims filed for widows or widowers insurance benefits based on disability under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U S C 405(g))					
864	SSID	All claims for supplemental security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security Act, as amended					
865	RSI	All claims for retirement (old age) and survivors benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U S C (g))					

CV-71 (05/08) CIVIL COVER SHEET Page 2 of 2